

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3, 10-11, 15, 18, 20-22, 24-28 and 31-41 remain in the application. Claim 35 has been cancelled herein.

Claims 1, 21-22, 25, 28, 36 and 37 have been objected to for grammatical reasons. These claims have been amended in the manner suggested by the Office action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 21-22, 25, 28, 36 and 37 is respectfully requested.

The Office action objects to the spelling of "stylised" and "utilised" within the specification. However, these are simply British spellings of the words and are acceptable in view of the MPEP. Please see Section 608.01 in the notes after the reference to 37 CFR 1.71. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the Specification.

Claims 18 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the feature "the connecting body moves at a speed lower than the conveying body" is questioned. The specification and original claims (e.g. claim 26) state that the velocity of the rolling body can be less than that of the conveying body. Also the specification shows the rolls of the rolling body being supported by the connecting

body and thus the connecting body can move along with the rolling body at the same speed (see Figs. 11A-D for example). Thus, the connecting body also can have a velocity less than the conveying body.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully requested.

Claims 28 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 35 has been cancelled herein. Claim 28 has been amended to state that the conveying body rolls on the rolling body. The “further rollers” questioned within the Office action, are associated with the conveying body and roll on an exterior surface of the guide rail. Note, that the rollers mentioned earlier in the claim are part of the rolling body and roll on the interior surfaces of the guide rails.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. FRR-16841.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

By /James A. Balazs/
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

38210 Glenn Avenue
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808
(216) 566-9700